

Appln. No. 10/671,428
Amendt. filed September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

MAIL STOP PATENT APPLICATION
Attorney Docket No. 82533

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are in the case, claims 11-15 having been added by a Preliminary Amendment filed at the same time the application was filed. Unfortunately, the Examiner did not examine the claims of the Preliminary Amendment, but examined only the claims contained in the original application.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, objected to Claims 7-10 as being in improper multiple dependent form, and rejected Claims 1, 2 and 6 as being anticipated by prior art.


The Objection to Claims 7-10 is moot in view of the Preliminary Amendment filed with the application. Accordingly, reconsideration of the Objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner did not examine Claims 7-15 and thus it would be unfair to Applicant to require a response to the rejection of Claim 1 until the position of the Examiner is known with respect to the claims present in the case but not examined. For this reason, the rejection of the claims is traversed and the Examiner is requested to fully examine all claims in the case.

It is noted that the Examiner was called at least three times and a Voice Mail was left each time, the last one being on the date this Response was filed. However, Applicant's representative did not receive any return calls.

Accordingly, the rejection of the claims is traversed for the reasons stated above, the objection to the claims is noted but is moot in view of the Preliminary Amendment, and the Examiner is requested to issue a further Office Action in which all claims have been Examined.

Respectfully submitted,


Harold L. Novick
Registration No. 26,011

Date: September 15, 2005

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC
1030 15th, Street, N.W., 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 775-8383